UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/586,929	05/24/2007	Jochen Buck	CFR D-3373-03 US 13089/46	8259
26646 KENYON & K	7590 03/06/200 ENYON LLP	EXAMINER		
ONE BROADY		STONE, CHRISTOPHER R		
NEW YORK, NY 10004			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1614	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/06/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/586,929	BUCK ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	CHRISTOPHER R. STONE	1614
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>08 December</u> This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑ This Since this application is in condition for alloware closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro	
Disposition of Claims		
4) ☐ Claim(s) 43-161 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) 43-151 is/are withdray 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 152-161 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or Application Papers 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ access that any objection to the content of	wn from consideration. relection requirement. r. epted or b) □ objected to by the B	
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correcti		
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form PTO-152.
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of 	s have been received. s have been received in Applicati ity documents have been receive ı (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	ate

Art Unit: 1614

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Applicant's election without traverse of Group IV (claims 152-161) in the reply filed on December 8, 2008 is acknowledged.

Claims 43-151 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 152-161 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

The specification discloses chemicals, such as the soluble adenylyl cyclase inhibitors of the formula of page 4 of the instant specification, lines 10-24, which meet the written description and enablement provisions of 35 USC 112, first paragraph. However, claims 152-161 directed to encompass all compounds that inhibit fungal or parasitic adenylyl cyclase, which only correspond in some undefined way (i.e. by function) to specifically instantly disclosed chemicals. None of these compounds meet

the written description provision of 35 USC § 112, first paragraph, due to lacking chemical structural information for what they are and chemical structures are highly variant and encompass a myriad of possibilities. The specification provides insufficient written description to support the genus encompassed by the claim.

<u>Vas-Cath Inc. v. Mahurkar</u>, 19 USPQ2d 1111, makes clear that "applicant must convey with reasonable clarity to those skilled in the art that, as of the filing date sought, he or she was in possession *of the invention*. The invention is, for purposes of the 'written description' inquiry, *whatever is now claimed*." (See page 1117.) The specification does not "clearly allow persons of ordinary skill in the art to recognize that [he or she] invented what is claimed." (See <u>Vas-Cath</u> at page 1116.)

With the exception of the above specifically disclosed chemical structures, the skilled artisan cannot envision the detailed chemical structure of the encompassed compounds that inhibit fungal or parasitic adenylyl cyclase, regardless of the complexity or simplicity of the method of isolation. Adequate written description requires more than a mere statement that it is part of the invention and reference to a potential method for isolating it. The chemical structure itself is required. See Fiers v. Revel, 25 USPQ2d 1601, 1606 (CAFC 1993) and Amgen Inc. V. Chugai Pharmaceutical Co. Ltd., 18 USPQ2d 1016. In Fiddes v. Baird, 30 USPQ2d 1481, 1483, claims directed to mammalian FGF's were found unpatentable due to lack of written description for the broad class. The specification provided only the bovine sequence. Finally, USPQ2d 1398, 1404, 1405 held that:

...To fulfill the written description requirement, a patent specification must

Application/Control Number: 10/586,929

Art Unit: 1614

describe an invention and do so in sufficient detail that one skilled in the art can clearly conclude that "the inventor invented the claimed invention." *Lockwood v. American Airlines, Inc.* , 107 F.3d 1565, 1572, 41 USPQ2d 1961, 1966 (1997); *In re Gosteli* , 872 F.2d 1008, 1012, 10 USPQ2d 1614, 1618 (Fed. Cir. 1989) (" [T]he description must clearly allow persons of ordinary skill in the art to recognize that [the inventor] invented what is claimed."). Thus, an applicant complies with the written description requirement "by describing the invention, with all its claimed limitations, not that which makes it obvious," and by using "such descriptive means as words, structures, figures, diagrams, formulas, etc., that set forth the claimed invention." *Lockwood* , 107 F.3d at 1572, 41 USPQ2d at 1966.

Page 4

Therefore, only the above chemically structurally defined chemicals, but not the full breadth of the claim(s) meet the written description provision of 35 USC § 112, first paragraph. The species specifically disclosed are not representative of the genus because the genus is highly variant. Applicant is reminded that <u>Vas-Cath</u> makes clear that the written description provision of 35 USC § 112 is severable from its enablement provision. (See page 1115.)

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 152-159 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 152 and 156, from which claims 153-155 and 157-159 depend, recite the limitations "the parasite" and "the fungal organism". There is insufficient antecedent basis for these limitations in the claims. That is, the active step limitations of claims 152 and 156 only require that the inhibitor contacts eukaryotic cells, there need be no parasite or fungal organism present.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States

Claims 152-155 and 160 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Rosenthal (Experimental Parasitology, Vol. 80, p. 272-281, 1995).

Claims 152-155 and 160 are drawn to a methods of inhibiting adenylyl cyclase of a parasite comprising contacting eukaryotic cells (or said parasite) with a compound that inhibits adenylyl cyclase of the parasite.

Rosenthal teaches contacting human erythrocytes, infected with the parasite *P. falciparum*, with sodium dodecyl sulfate, a compound that denatures proteins, and therefore necessarily inhibits all proteins including adenylyl cyclase of *P. falciparum* (p. 273, right column).

Claims 156-159 and 161 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Bailey et al (Infection and Immunity, 63(2), p. 569-572, 1995).

Claims 156-159 and 161 are drawn to a methods of inhibiting adenylyl cyclase of a fungal organism comprising contacting eukaryotic cells (or said fungal organism) with a compound that inhibits adenylyl cyclase of the fungal organism.

Bailey et al teaches contacting human buccal epithelial cells infected with the fungal organism *C. albicans* with sodium dodecyl sulfate, a compound that denatures proteins, and therefore necessarily inhibits all proteins including adenylyl cyclase of *C. albicans* (p. 570, left column).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to CHRISTOPHER R. STONE whose telephone number is (571)270-3494. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday, 7:30am-4:00pm EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ardin H. Marschel can be reached on (571) 272-0718. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/586,929 Page 7

Art Unit: 1614

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

24February2009 CRS

/Patricia A. Duffy/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1645